

REMARKS

Claims 2, 6, 8, 11, 13, and 14 are canceled.

Claim 1 is amended to include the limitations of claim 2 (now canceled).

Claim 3 is amended to depend from claim 1.

Claim 4 is amended to be an independent claim including the limitations of original independent claim 1.

Claim 7 is amended to include the limitations of claim 8 (now canceled).

Claim 9 is amended to depend from claim 7.

Claim 10 is amended to be an independent claim including the limitations of original independent claim 7.

Claim 12 is amended to include the limitations of claim 13 (now canceled).

Claim 15 is amended to depend from claim 12.

The Office Action in the parent application, 09/532,538, dated, August 22, 2003, fails to show that US patent 6,336,124 B1 to Alam et al. ("Alam") anticipates claims 1-5, 7-10, 12-13, and 15-17 under 35 USC §102(e). The rejection is respectfully traversed because the Office Action fails to show that all the limitations are identically taught by Alam.

Independent claims 1, 7, as amended with the limitations of claims 2 and 8, respectively, include limitations that relate to clustering the words in each line into word clusters and identifying table data based on the number of word clusters in each line and the alignment of the clusters between lines. The Office Action fails to show that Alam teaches these limitations. Specifically, the Office Action cites Alam's col. 1, ll. 61-65 as teaching these limitations. However, nothing in this section appears to relate to word clusters, nor to identifying table data based on the numbers of word clusters and alignment of word clusters. If the rejection is maintained, an explanation of Alam's elements that are believed to teach these limitations is respectfully requested. Otherwise, the rejection should be withdrawn for failing to show that Alam anticipates claims 1 and 7.

Independent claims 4, 10, and 12, as amended with the limitations of claims 1, 7, and 13, respectively, include limitations that relate to determining a table bounding box for each found table, expanding the bounding box based on a text density feature, and converting the table data

encompassed by each bounding box to a markup language representation. The Office Action fails to show that Alam identically teaches these limitations. For example, the cited sections of Alam do not appear to relate to a text density feature. Alam's col. 6, ll. 40-65 mentions characters and their fonts, sizes weights (bold or normal), underlines and locations; Alam's col. 12, ll. 53-58 mentions converting an intermediate data format to an output format such as HTML, XML, etc.; Alam's col. 13, ll. 26-34 mentions processing blocks of intermediate data individually, in multiple groups, or all at once; and Alam's figures 6, 11, and 12 illustrate an imaging an conversion system, a high-level flow for converting data from an intermediate format to a selected output format, and a generalized flow for converting an intermediate data format to RTF or HTML style sheets. None of these cited portions appears to mention or illustrate text density or any use thereof. If the rejection is maintained, an explanation of Alam's elements that are believed to teach these limitations is respectfully requested. Otherwise, the rejection should be withdrawn for failing to show that Alam anticipates claims 4, 10, and 12.

Claims 3 and 9 include further limitations that relate determining column information from the word clusters. Because the Office Action fails to show that Alam teaches the limitations of claims 1 and 7 relating to word clusters, the Office Action also fails to teach the further limitations relating to word clusters as set forth in claims 3 and 9. Therefore, the Office Action fails to establish that claims 3 and 9 are anticipated by Alam.

Claim 5 depends from claim 4, and the Office Action fails to show that Alam anticipates claim 5 for at least the reasons set forth above in regards to claim 4.


Claim 15 depends from claim 12, and the Office Action fails to show that Alam anticipates claim 15 for at least the reasons set forth above in regards to claim 12.

Claims 16 and 17 depend from claim 1 and the Office Action fails to show that Alam anticipates these claims for at least the reasons set forth above in regards to claim 1.

The Office Action fails to show that Schreiber teaches all the limitations of the claims, and therefore, does fails to establish that Alam anticipates claims 1, 3, 4-5, 7, 9-10, 12, and 15-17. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

CRAWFORD MAUNU PLLC
1270 Northland Drive, Suite 390
Saint Paul, MN 55120
(651) 686-6633

By: 
Name: LeRoy D. Maunu
Reg. No.: 35,274